

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Formalities

The claims and specification have been revised to place the application in proper U.S. format, and to correct various grammatical and idiomatic errors. Because the changes are all formal in nature, it is respectfully submitted that the changes do not involve new matter.

2. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-5 Under 35 USC §102(b) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,673,986 (Koo)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Koo patent fails to disclose or suggest a projection system in which a light beam from a light source is reflected by a reflection mirror so as to be **obliquely** incident onto a *light valve*, and a wedge prism is disposed in the optical path from the light source to the light valve in order to focus the reflected light beam onto the surface of the light valve. Instead, light from source 40 of Koo is reflected by wedge prism 100 so as to be **perpendicularly** incident on lens 50 and *light valve* 60.

The purpose of the reflective wedge prism 100 of Koo is to narrow the light beam incident on the light valve 60. There is no need to compensate for obliqueness between the reflected beam and the light valve because the reflective surface at the rear of the prism 100 of Koo is oriented so as to reflect the source beam at a 90° angle. Narrowing of a light beam using a wedge prism, as taught by Koo, has nothing to do with the purpose of the claimed prism, which is to compensate for differences between the focus plane of the light source and the plane of the light valve, resulting from the oblique angle of incidence onto the light valve. Use of an oblique angle has the advantage of reducing the size of the projector, even though it makes it more difficult to focus the source light on the light valve.

Because the present claims specifically recite an oblique angle of incidence with respect to the surface of the light valve (described in connection with Figs. 4-6 of the original application as the angle between reflected beams 103 and surface 171), it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-5 are not anticipated by the Koo patent, and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3- 5 under 35 USC §102(b) is respectfully requested..

3. Rejection of Claims 1-4 Under 35 USC §103(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,352,346 (Kasai)

This rejection is respectfully traversed on the grounds that the Kasai patent fails to disclose or suggest a projection system in which a light beam from a light source is reflected by a reflection mirror so as to be obliquely incident onto a light valve, and in which a wedge prism is disposed in the optical path between (i) the light source and the reflection device, and (ii) the reflection device and the light valve, in order to focus the reflected light beam onto the surface of the light valve. Instead, wedge prism 2 of Kasai is disposed (i) between a beam selector 1 and light valve 3, and (ii) between the light valve 3 and the a projection lens 100.

Even if beam selector 1 of Kasai is considered to be a “reflector,” the wedge prism 2 is not interposed between the light source and the reflector, but only between the reflector and the light valve. In effect, the wedge of Kasai is disposed on the outgoing side of the reflector rather than the incoming side as in the claimed invention.

This structural difference is not merely a matter of design choice. It has to do with the very different functions of the claimed wedge prism and wedge prism 2 of Kasai. Whereas wedge prism 2 of Kasai is included for the purpose of ensuring separation between light beams that are incident on and reflected by the surface of light valve 3, to enable both the incident and reflected light beams from the light valve to pass through the beam selector 1, the claimed wedge prism rotates the focal plane of the reflector so that light beams are focused on the light valve despite the obliqueness of the angle of incidence on the light valve. As a result, the claimed

Serial Number 10/651,990

invention involves a much simpler structure than the image forming device of the Kasai patent, which requires a beam separator 1 and two wedge prisms 2,4 in addition to the light valve 3.

Because the Kasai patent fails to disclose or suggest a wedge prism situated between a light source and a reflector, and between the reflector and a light valve (as opposed to being situated on opposite sides of the light valve), withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4 in view of the Kasai patent is respectfully requested.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: September 3, 2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Telephone: (703) 683-0500

NWB-S:\Product\Dev\Fending Q...ZS\SHYU 651990a01.wpd